

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/616,267	07/09/2003	Jason R. Sullivan	BSI-350US1	1701	
23122 75	590 08/15/2006		EXAM	INER	
RATNERPRESTIA			HO, UYEN T		
P O BOX 980 VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3731		
			DATE MAILED: 00/15/200	DATE MAILED: 09/15/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		XY
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/616,267	SULLIVAN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho	3731
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH atute, cause the application to become ABAN	ATION. y be timely filed S from the mailing date of this communication. IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0	9 July 2003.	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Γhis action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	wance except for formal matters	s, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice und	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 1	I1, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>55-88</u> is/are pending in the applica	ation.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>55-88</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	nd/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exan	niner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		
Applicant may not request that any objection to		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the attached (Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
 Certified copies of the priority docum 		
2. Certified copies of the priority docum		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the		eceived in this National Stage
application from the International Bu		and the said
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not re	eceivea.
A((-,		
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Sur	mmary (PTO-413)
 Notice of References Cited (P10-692) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)) Paper No(s)/	Mail Date
3) 🔯 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE		ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/9/03.	о) <u>— О</u> спет	

Art Unit: 3731

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 7/9/03 is acknowledged 1. and considered.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 55-88 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-53 of U.S. Patent No. 6,607,551. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the present application either anticipated or an obvious variant of the claimed invention of the patent..

Application/Control Number: 10/616,267

Art Unit: 3731

Page 3

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 5. Claims 55-57, 61-63, 65-70, 72-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Limon et al. (6,077,295). Limon et al. disclose a stent delivery device comprising a stabilizer (24) comprising configuration as claimed, an outer sheath as claimed (25), and a stent as claimed (28). Regarding claim 57, the member (30) including a plurality of connected rings or radial protuberances.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 58-60, 64, 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Limon et al. '295 in view of Ravenscroft (5,702,418). Limon et al. disclose all the

Art Unit: 3731

limitations as claimed except for a presence of radial protuberance having configuration as claimed in claims 58-60, 64, and 71. Ravenscroft discloses radial protuberances comprising rings about an inner core (figs 1-7). Ravenscroft also suggests that the rings should be modified for receiving portions of the stent overlying the rings, a ring can be formed or defined by a plurality of protuberances or fingers that extend from a core or similar structure to engage and interlock with portions of the stent with a minimum inner diameter (col. 8, lines 10-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Limon et al.'s radial protuberances to have a plurality rings or broken rings and with many different pattern in order to accommodate stent structures as well as to improve the radial flexibility of the distal end of the stent delivery systems.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to (Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho whose telephone number is 571-272-4696. The examiner can normally be reached on MULTIFLEX Mon. to Sat..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ANHTUAN NGUYEN can be reached on 571-272-4963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3731

August 12, 2006